DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 310 411 CS 212 062

AUTHOR Hasley, Linda
TITLE The Effectiveness of Peer Collaboration on the Writing of Female Freshman Composition Students: A Preliminary Study.
PUB DATE 89
NOTE 105p.; M.A. Thesis, University of Oklahoma.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Master Theses (042) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Analysis of Variance; *Cooperative Learning; *Females; *Freshman Composition; Group Instruction; Higher Education; *Peer Groups; *Student Writing Models; Writing Processes; Writing Skills
IDENTIFIERS *Collaborative Writing; Writing Development; *Writing Groups

ABSTRACT

A study investigated the effect or lack of effect of peer collaboration on the writing of female freshman composition students. Four freshman composition classes conducted by two experienced instructors participated in a 3-week study. One instructor taught two classes by teacher-lecture and teacher-led discussions exclusively. Another instructor taught two classes using peer collaborative grouping almost exclusively. Research guidelines from George Hillocks and scoring guidelines by Charles Cooper were used. The students were given a pretest and a posttest, which were scored according to a seven-point general impression marking scale. An analysis of variance of the raw scores showed no statistically significant difference between the females and males in either the teacher-lecture groups or the peer collaboration groups. In the teacher-lecture treatment, the females made some improvement in their overall writing skills, but in the peer collaboration treatment, the females showed a loss, which suggests the possibility that females do not fare as well as males in group situations. Perhaps the most significant discovery was that the terminology regarding peer collaboration, collaborative learning, grouping, etc. is not clearly defined in composition research, and that until this omission is corrected, collective research in this area will continue to be vague, disconnected, and difficult to interpret by those interested in peer collaboration as a way of teaching writing. (Ten tables of data are included; seven student essays and 79 references are attached.) (Author/KEH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED310411

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF PEER COLLABORATION ON THE WRITING OF FEMALE FRESHMAN COMPOSITION STUDENTS: A PRELIMINARY STUDY

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Linda Hasley

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

By

LINDA HASLEY

Norman, Oklahoma

1989

CS212062

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ABSTRACT

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF PEER COLLABORATION
ON THE WRITING OF FEMALE FRESHMAN COMPOSITION STUDENTS:
A PRELIMINARY STUDY

BY: LINDA HASLEY

MAJOR PROFESSOR: DAVID MAIR

This study investigated the effect or lack of effect of peer collaboration on the writing of female freshman composition students. Four freshman composition classes conducted by two experienced instructors participated in a three week study. One instructor taught two classes by teacher-lecture and teacher-led discussions exclusively. Another instructor taught two classes using peer collaborative grouping almost exclusively. Research guidelines from George Hillocks and scoring guidelines by Charles Cooper were used. The students were given a pre-test and a post-test which were scored according to a seven-point general impression marking scale. An analysis of variance of the raw scores showed no statistically significant difference between the females and males in either the teacher-lecture groups or the peer collaboration

groups. As this was a small study conducted over a short period of time, astronomical results were not anticipated, however; the importance of this study lies in the raw scores. In the teacher-lecture treatment, the females made some improvement in their overall writing skills, but in the peer collaboration treatment, the females showed a loss which suggests the possibility that females do not fare as well as males in group situations. This possibility is worthy of further investigation. Perhaps the most significant discovery in this study is that the terminology regarding peer collaboration, collaborative learning, grouping, etc. is not clearly defined in composition research, and that until that omission is corrected, collective research in this area will continue to be vague, disconnected, and difficult to interpret by those interested in peer collaboration as a way of teaching writing.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS vi

INTRODUCTION 1

CHAPTER I. REVIEW OF THE LITERARURE

A. Theory of Pedagogy in Peer Collaboration 7

B. Empirical Studies of Peer Collaboration 12

C. Empirical Studies of Peer Collaboration and Subject Gender 17

D. Gender and Language Studies in Other Fields 20

E. Need for the Study 23

CHAPTER II. RESEARCH DESIGN

A. Project in Progress 26

B. Scoring of Essays 34

CHAPTER III. DATA

A. Explanation of Tables 37

B. Summary 39

C. Tables 41

CHAPTER IV. CONCLUSIONS

A. Implications 51

B. Proposed Research Design 52

APPENDIX

A. Observers' Reports 58

B. Sample Anchors 61

C. Abbreviations for Periodicals . . 87

WORKS CITED 88

WORKS CONSULTED 97

INTRODUCTION

In 1978 Kenneth Bruffee's "The Brooklyn Plan: Attaining Intellectual Growth through Peer-Group Tutoring" was published. Since that time and as a direct result of that publication, teaching writing through group work and peer collaboration has once again been embraced by a large number of teachers at all levels.[1] The degree of group work and peer collaboration varies greatly depending on both the teacher and the situation. If a scale were devised depicting variations of peer collaboration, at one end of the scale might be a simple form of peer collaboration which would involve one student editing another student's paper with the help of a teacher-prepared revision guide. At the other end of the scale might be the utilization of peer collaboration through group work in every stage of the writing process including invention and revision.

Included in that large number of teachers who

---

[1] Group work and peer collaboration certainly were not unknown to writing teachers before Bruffee's publication.

incorporate group work and peer collaboration into their teaching are feminists who, concerned that writing instructors are influenced by an arbitrary patriarchal authority, are searching for the means to release women writers from the silence by which they are bound.[2] They contend that the mode of teaching described by Bruffee is more likely than other modes of teaching to improve the writing of female students. Representative of those feminists is Wendy Goulston who subscribes to peer collaboration in "Women Writing" because it "requires a skill that female students have already acquired and which provides them with the respect and nurturing support they need" (Caywood 25).[3] This statement by Goulston implies that through group interaction females will have their ideas and opinions respected and supported. However, in the same essay she writes:

> [W]omen's traditional sex role socialization . . . prepares them to be nurturers, listeners, and assimilators, . . . Thus women become good in

---

[2] The first chapter in Teaching Writing: Pedagogy, Gender and Equity which is edited by Cynthia Caywood and Gillian R. Overing is titled "Old Silences, New Voices," and includes four essays concerned with women speaking and writing out of "a tradition of silence."

[3] Scholars Carol Gilligan, Wendy Goulston, Carol Stanger, Pamela Annas, Alice S. Horning, Olivia Frey, Cynthia L. Caywood, and Gillian R. Overing, to mention a few.

> private conversation, especially in the role of empathizing, acknowledging and responding to someone else (Caywood 19).

Apparently, Goulston is arguing that in group situations, females both receive and give nurturing and support; what she does not say is from whom females receive nurturing and support of their ideas and opinions. Goulston continues:

> Thus women become good in private conversation, especially in the role of empathizing, acknowledging and responding to someone else. Along with this women are taught to be more concerned with relationship than with logical, conceptual thinking. They are taught the skills, and, more deeply, the attitude of pleasing people, rather than of standing up for themselves when it may or may not please others (Caywood 19).

The attributes that Goulston feels females bring to group situations certainly would serve to enhance the success of a group task, but how do those attributes of compromise and empathy contribute to the improvement of females' writing skills? Goulston also writes "women are often not sure of their own ideas, especially when asked to express themselves in rhetorical forms that have been used almost exclusively by men," and she adds, "[women] trust to other's [male] authority when any important decision or action in the public world is to be made" (Caywood 19).

With these words, Goulston appears to be supporting the very silence and devaluation of women's words that feminists are attempting to overcome, and which peer collaboration groups made up of both sexes apparently encourage.

In "Sexual Politics of the One-To-One Tutorial Approach," Carol Stanger supports Goulson's argument. Stanger writes:

> [M]ost male students tend to protect their individual opinions and fight for the answers that are `right', whereas most female students push for compromise even at the expense of forwarding [forfeiting] their own opinions, so that the ideas of everyone in the group are included and nobody is left out (Caywood 41).

Do both Goulston and Stanger feel that females gain writing skills while their ideas and opinions are being diluted and compromised? The bottom line is that writing is a solitary action. What happens when those same females who have been concerned about the feelings of others in a group situation and who have been hesitant to express themselves before the male authority sit down alone to compose an essay?

In the literature review to follow, several studies will be discussed which support the views of Stanger and Goulston. Assuming that Stanger's description of males and females in group collaboration is correct, what do her

comments tell us about the quality of writing that females in those groups produce? Studies which will be discussed in chapter one have been conducted to discover the effects of group work involving collaboration on the quality of writing of students, regardless of gender, but none, until this study, have been conducted comparing the writing of male and female freshmen composition students engaged in peer collaboration. Is there a significant difference in the writing produced by students in peer collaboration groups when compared by gender? This is the question this preliminary study attempts to answer.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this preliminary study is to investigate experimentally the need or lack of need for further study in the effect of peer collaboration on the writing of female freshmen composition students.

PROBLEM

The problem is to create a research design which measures the effect of peer collaboration on the writing of female freshmen composition students.

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF PEER COLLABORATION ON THE WRITING OF FEMALE FRESHMAN COMPOSITION STUDENTS: A PRELIMINARY STUDY

CHAPTER ONE

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

A thorough search of the literature was conducted beginning with Braddock, Lloyd-Jones, and Schoer's Research in Written Composition (1963) which evaluates 504 writing studies, continuing with George Hillock's Research on Written Composition: A New Direction for Teaching (1986) which examines over 2000 studies from 1963 to 1982, Dissertation Abstracts International from 1982 until April 1988, and concluding with the 1982 through April 1988 ERIC/CIJE indices which list titles from 780 international educational journals and periodicals. This search which includes studies using varying degrees of peer collaboration[4] revealed some interesting data.

Of the fifty-five articles, essays and dissertations

---

[4] For the purposes of this study all references to any type of group work or peer collaboration will be referred to as peer collaboration.

examined which address the teaching of writing through peer collaboration in-process groups, only thirty-one examined which address the teaching of writing through peer collaboration were actual empirical studies measuring the effect or lack of effect of peer collaboration, and three of those used protocol analysis which cannot be translated into significant statistics. Only five of the collaborative in-process group studies mentioned differences according to subject gender. The fifty-five works and the section on "Need For The Study" are categorized according to the following format:

Theory of Pedagogy in Peer Collaboration

Empirical Studies of Peer Collaboration

Empirical Studies of Peer Collaboration and Subject Gender

Gender and Language Studies in Other Disciplines

Need for the Study

Theory of Pedagogy in Peer Collaboration

Of the twenty-four articles in this section, ten neither discouraged nor encouraged peer collaboration for teaching writing, twelve strongly encouraged peer collaboration with specific controls, and two strongly disapproved of peer collaboration.

Offer No Recommendation

(1) Jane L. Brown (1984) offers a guide for organizing a system of peer evaluation of student essays. The author lists advantages of peer evaluation and specific pitfalls to avoid.

(2) Gray Cavanaugh and Ken Styles (1983) discuss three methods of evaluating student papers, and provide guidelines for peer and self evaluation, and teacher scoring.

(3) "Cooperative Learning in the Urban Classroom" (1987) describes the advantages of cooperative learning, and offers six successful activities.

(4) James H. Flynn and Dwight A. Williams, Jr. (1976) follow George Hillock's "natural" teaching mode which allows the students to determine their own learning activities within groups.

(5) Margaret Mclaughlin and Ruth Fennick argue for using peer collaboration in the invention stages of writing rather than in the editing stage. They discuss how this process affected their own composition classes, and warn other teachers that the poorer students like peer collaboration much more than the better students.

(6) Paula Pomerenke (1984) discusses the necessary techniques for successful application of peer revision and evaluation.

(7) Ellery Sedgwick (1984) describes an exercise in which students are required to write position

papers, read them to their groups, and listen to rebuttals. The students are expected to correct their papers accordingly.

(8) Robert Slavin (1987) suggests ways for reorganizing classes into peer collaboration groups to implement higher-learning activities.

(9) Sarah Benesch (1985) proposes observing peer groups using their own language and their own ways of discussing in the classroom to determine which combination is most successful for learning specific skills.

(10) "Using Small Groups in the English Classroom" (1987) is a survey of the group teaching techniques of eight teachers from junior high through university classes.

Recommend With Specific Controls

(1) Kenneth A. Bruffee (1984) stresses peer collaboration for students as an opportunity to experience academic discourse in a social atmosphere.

(2) Kenneth A. Bruffee (1987) feels that students should be prepared to interact in a society that is becoming more and more collaborative, and that they should learn methods of discovery through interaction with their peers. He believes through group discussions, students will discover attributes they are not aware they have.

(3) Alan Cooper (1986) suggests requiring a daily journal entry for peer evaluation and revision. Ostensibly this will provide ample writing time and opportunities for peer input without overloading the teacher.

(4) Albert DeCiccio (1988) argues that writing is a social act, and peer collaboration should be a part of all writing classes. He relies on theoretical and pedagogical history to support his claim.

(5) Ann Hill Duin (1986) states that group work encourages cooperation rather than competition. She describes assignments and activities for peer collaboration.

(6) Jane Hansen (1983) claims that grouping peers during the writing process helps students to make connections between reading and writing.

(7) Heleen Owen (1987) describes the attributes of peer collaboration in incorporating minorities and majorities.

(8) Carolyn Piazza and Carl Tomlinson (1985) claim that talk among peers during the writing process gives students an awareness of that process.

(9) Byron Stay (1985) argues that peer collaboration integrates speech and writing which instills confidence in beginning writers, and encourages revision.

(10) Ellen Strenski (1982) finds peer group revision sessions along with revision guides to be extremely

successful in her history classes.

(11) Michael Tritt (1984) urges group work for invention, evaluation, and revision to realize full benefit from collaboration.

(12) Anthony J. Wesson (1986) supports peer collaboration learning as a way to avoid autonomy in the classroom.

Strongly Against

(1) Greg Myers (1986) objects to teachers relinquishing their authority to peer groups as they critique each others' writing. Myers fears conformity.

(2) Harvey S. Wiener (1986) poses an important question: How do you evaluate the effectiveness of teachers in the atmosphere created by peer collaboration? As formal assessment of an instructor's teaching skills is a part of the system, Weiner feels that teachers using peer collaboration must derive a method for evaluating themselves. Until they do, Wiener feels teachers should not rely too heavily on peer collaboration.

A general consensus of the effectiveness of peer collaboration in the teaching of composition cannot be reached as the above articles are too varied and address different aspects of this particular mode of teaching. What can be determined, however, is that none of the works addresses the effectiveness of peer collaboration on the writing of female students as opposed to the writing of male

students.

Empirical Studies of Peer Collaboration

Of the twenty-six empirical studies examined below, two report a significant gain in students' writing skills and three report a positive student reaction to peer collaborative writing groups. Six studies report a slight gain, and in two studies, the students suffer losses in their writing abilities. Thirteen studies find no difference in the improvement of the writing skills or the attitudes of students involved in peer collaboration.

Significant Gains Or Attitude Improvement

(1) Kathleen Bouton and Gary Tutty (1975) in a study of two tenth-grade classes report that peer editing is significantly more effective than teacher grading. They also report that peer editing saves the teachers time.

(2) William Roberts (1985) found peer editing with grammar reviews to be significantly more effective than teacher editing without grammar reviews in the students' ability to write business letters.

(3) Mary Francine Danis (1980) recorded peer criticism sessions in a sophomore-level writing class at Michigan State University. In a survey at the end of the session, all students felt the peer interaction

increased their writing confidence.

(4) Jacqueline Finn (1985) studied the effect of peer conferences on twenty-eight gifted elementary students, and concludes that interaction between peers provides positive support.

(5) Patricia Kelly (1984) restructured her writing class to combat students' apathy. Through involvement in collaborative groups, the students developed a more positive attitude toward writing, less competitiveness, less teacher dependence, and more cooperation.

Slight Gain in Writing Skills or Attitude

(1) Bob Wayne Ford (1973) concludes that college freshmen whose papers were graded and edited by peers showed more improvement than those whose papers were edited and graded by the teacher.

(2) John Patrick Clifford (1980) concludes that peer collaboration is slightly more effective on writing performance than teacher-lecture but has little effect on reducing mechanical errors and increasing vocabulary.

(3) Mary K. Jordan (1984) found the only positive effect of peer review to be in the students' attitudes toward revision.

(4) Joyce Katstra (1987) in a study with ninth-graders discovered that peer evaluation slightly improved attitude and writing fluency.

(5) Patricia Swift (1986) reports only a slight improvement in students' writing when comparing groups using peer review and self-evaluation to groups receiving no feedback.

(6) Angela O'Donnell (1985) deals with the ability to communicate. Students who wrote alone were less effective than those who wrote in pairs.

Loss In Writing Skills

(1) Barbara Joy Craig (1981) investigated the effects of oral responses on a freshman composition class. The scores declined rather than increased, and she determines that oral responses by peers have no effect on students' writing.

(2) Angela O'Donnell (1987) designed a study to test students revising individually, and students revising in pairs. The students who rewrote individually scored higher than those who rewrote in pairs.

No Difference In Writing Skills Or Attitude

(1) Lynn Meeks (1985) used observation to investigate how third-graders revised in peer groups. She found that question asking by editors was necessary to helpful revision.

(2) Sarah Benesch (1986) reviews transcripts of one group in a freshman writing workshop, and identifies and

Two experienced raters scored using a seven point scale (2-8). A third rater scored four essays which received scores by the original raters more than two points apart. The third rater exactly matched one of the original raters' scores on all four essays. The raters were trained with essays from the project which had either no pre-test or no post-test. The raters achieved a reliability coefficient of 0.91 on the sample essays.

Two hours were spent with the two raters selected for scoring the study until they reached a reliability coefficient of 0.91 when scoring the anchors or samples. The two raters then spent three hours scoring the 126 essays. They were allowed a difference of two points on the essays, a difference allowed by the Educational Testing Service for scoring English Composition tests and Advanced Placement tests in English.

Chapter three discusses the results of the project and the conclusions and suggestions for further study reached by the experimenter.

CHAPTER THREE

DATA

Explanation of Tables

The data derived from the experiment focuses on the differences in the writing of female and male freshman composition students participating in two different treatments, teacher-lecture or control group and peer collaboration or experimental group.

Tables one through six show data taken from raw scores. Table one summarizes the raw scores taken from the pre-tests and post-tests of Group C-F, the females in the control or teacher-lecture treatment. The pre-test mean for Group C-F is 4.43 and the post-test mean is 4.36 showing a loss of 0.07. Table two summarizes the raw scores taken from the pre-tests and post-tests of Group C-M, the males in the teacher-lecture treatment. The pre-test mean for Group C-M is 4.04 and the post-test mean is 4.09 showing a gain of 0.05. Table three shows the raw scores from the entire teacher-lecture or control treatment, Group C. The pre-test mean for this group is 4.24 and the post-test mean is 4.22

showing a loss of 0.02.

Table four summarizes the raw scores taken from the pre-tests and post-tests of Group E-F, the females in the experimental or peer collaboration treatment. The pre-test mean for this group is 4.10 and the post-test mean is 3.72 showing a loss of 0.39. Table five summarizes the raw scores taken from the pre-tests and post-tests of Group E-M, the males in the experimental treatment. The pre-test mean for this group is 4.03 and the post-test mean is 4.28 showing a gain of 0.25. Table six shows the raw scores from the entire experimental treatment. The pre-test mean for this group, Group E, is 4.08 and the post-test mean is 3.97 showing a loss of 0.10.

Table three shows that the entire control treatment exhibited a loss in writing skills for writing a persuasive essay with the females showing a loss of 0.07. However, the males in this group showed a gain of 0.04. Table six shows that the entire experimental treatment, Group E, slightly improved their writing skills for writing a persuasive essay. Tables four and five show that only the males in the treatment improved their writing skills while the females in the treatment show a loss. Table seven shows that the all the groups combined exhibit a loss of 0.05.

Tables eight through ten are taken from the results of an analysis of variance which allows for differences in the pre-tests which might affect the study. The differences are not statistically significant. Table eight shows the means

analyses behavior.

(3) John Beard (1979) reports on a small study of teachers and students involved in peer group writing situations, and discusses the advantages and disadvantages of peer groups.

(4) Carol Berkenhotter (1984) feels that personality, maturity, and ability strongly influence the success of peer evaluation. This study was conducted by an analysis of protocols depicting how subjects responded to group evaluation.

(5) Roberta S. Boss (1986) compared the effects of peer group critiques versus direct teacher instruction on writing skills and revision in a freshman composition course. She reports no significant differences.

(6) Linda Degroff (1985) studied twenty high-knowledge and twenty low-knowledge fourth graders, and discovered that prior knowledge does improve the responses to peer conferences.

(7) Michael Graner (1986) studied two groups including one which used peer editing, and could find no significant difference between the two.

(8) Michael Kleine (1985) analyses conversations in small groups of freshman composition students, and suggests ways to improve discussions.

(9) Martha McManus (1986) studied a group of six students from a tenth-grade class. She used notes, tapes, journals, questionnaires, and writing samples to aid

her in counting, categorizing, and comparing behaviors exhibited in the group. She makes no recommendation.

(10) William David Lyons (1976) found in a study involving 106 tenth-graders no significant difference in the writing of those who received teacher-peer response, and those who received teacher-only response.

(11) Thomas Newkirk ("Direction and Misdirection" (1984) concludes that teachers and students use different criteria for evaluating student papers.

(12) In another article Newkirk ("How Students" 1984) used protocol analysis to compare evaluations of two freshman papers by teachers of composition and students of composition. Newkirk reports that students and teachers did not apply the same criteria when evaluating.

(13) Shirley Petty (1986) examined writing samples and a survey in studying the influence of peer groups on eighth-graders. The study offers no conclusions.

The evidence from all these studies is clear. Through April 1988 only twenty-six empirical studies directly related to peer collaboration as it effects writing have been conducted. Only two of those studies find a significant improvement in writing skills which can be attributed to peer collaboration. Four demonstrate a slight improvement in writing skills, and two report a loss in writing skills. One of the studies which shows a

significant improvement in writing ability as a result of peer collaboration had another variable in the research design. The group which showed marked improvement had access to a grammar review while the other group did not. The researcher does not determine the effects of the grammar review. As was stated earlier, thirteen researchers report no difference in writing improvement in the groups which practiced peer collaboration and those who were taught by teacher-lecture. The fault may be in the research designs or it may be contributed to teacher ability, but, nevertheless, the verdict is still out as to the benefits of peer collaboration on writing improvement.

Empirical Studies of Peer Collaboration and Subject Gender

In these three studies and in two others not published before April 1988, the subject of gender was at least addressed. The researchers in three of four studies using general impression marking found that males improved more in peer collaborative groups than females. In the fourth study, females improved more than males with peer evaluation. Another unpublished study using open-ended primary trait scoring has been conducted at the University of Oklahoma by Professors Michael Flanigan and David Mair. In this study of more than 400 freshman composition students, Flanigan and Mair found that females improved more than males in both the peer collaboration classes and the teacher-lecture classes with the females in the teacher-

lecture classes showing the most improvement.[4]

Males' Writing Improves More Than Females

(1) Kevin James Farrell (1977) conducted a study comparing three instructional methods designed to improve the writing skills of high school juniors. The effects of these methods were measured and compared among treatment groups and within these groups in terms of individual learner characteristics. The instructional methods were peer evaluation, tutoring, and teacher lecture with peer evaluation and tutored classes being the experimental groups and teacher lecture classes being the control group. Ferrell found no significant difference in the writing of students in the peer evaluation classes and students in the teacher lecture classes. However, tutoring seemed to favor females and peer evaluation males.

(2) Charles Frederick Myers (1979) conducted a study to determine the effectiveness of teacher and peer feedback in seventh and eighth grade students' acquisition of two specific composition skills, punctuation and paragraph unity. Myers found no

---

[4] This study used peer collaboration with specific activities designed to teach higher level thinking and writing skills which could be measured by open-ended primary trait scoring.

significant difference between the control group and the experimental group in either punctuation or paragraph unity. Myers did find that females using the teacher method tended to show higher achievement than males using that same method, and slightly lower achievement than the males in the peer feedback group.

(4) John Frederick Reynolds (1987) reports slightly more improvement in male freshman composition students than in females when using peer collaboration to test students' awareness of audience. Reynolds suggests that further study is indicated.

Females Improve More Than Males

(1) Bonnie Jean McKenzie King (1981) compared the effects of the traditional method of teaching composition with teachers evaluating written papers to the effects of evaluation by small peer groups. Both groups showed a loss in mean scores. A two-way analysis of variance showed there was a significant difference in the treatment effects on males and females. The females in the peer groups received increased mean scores from pre-test two to post-tests six and seven.

(2) Michael Flanigan and David Mair found that female freshman composition students improved more than males in both collaborative learning groups and in teacher-lecture. The most significant improvement being in the

teacher-lecture groups. Flanigan and Mair used open-ended primary trait rating as opposed to the general impression marking used in the other studies.

None of these studies addressed subject gender as the primary motive for conducting the studies. All five of them did, however, find evidence that subject gender was an element worthy of investigation in the study of peer collaboration groups as they affect writing.

Gender and Language Studies in Other Fields

Literature concerning written composition, peer collaboration, and gender can be described as anything but proliferate. Other than the feminists mentioned in the introduction, few scholars profess an interest in the writing of females as it is affected by peer collaboration. This lack of scholarship creates the necessity of turning to other disciplines for evidence. Scholars of linquistics, sociolinquistics, human relations, speech communication, and feminists literary criticism have written articles and conducted studies concerning the behavior of males and females in group situations.

The following studies support Goulston and Stanger's views that women's ideas and words are devalued in group conversations which include males and females.

(1) Candace West and Don Zimmerman (1975, 1983)

conducted two studies which measured interruptions and overlaps in same-sex and cross-sex conversations.[5] In the first study which was conducted with acquaintances as subjects the males made ninety-six percent of the interruptions and one hundred percent of the overlaps in the cross-sex conversations. In the same-sex conversations the number of interruptions and overlaps were equal.

(2) In the second study using unacquainted subjects, the men made seventy-five percent of the interruptions.

(3) Pamela Fishman (1983) monitored the conversations of three married couples. She found that the women did much more of the conversational "work" than the men. For example, the women asked two and one-half times the number of questions the men asked, they also consistently provided supportive utterances, timed so that they rarely overlapped the men's statements. But despite the conversational "work" being performed by the women, Fishman found that the men clearly controlled the choice of topics. Of the twenty-nine topics raised by men, twenty-eight were successfully pursued, but of the forty-seven raised by women, only seventeen were pursued. The thirty topics which failed did so because of a lack of response on the part of the

---

[5] West and Zimmerman define interruptions as violations of turn-taking in conversation, and overlaps as errors in turn-taking in conversation.

men. Fishman concludes, "The definition of what is appropriate or inappropriate conversation becomes the man's choice" (98).

(4) Jennifer Coates (1986) discusses sex differences in language as a result of social and not biological pressures. In chapter six she discusses mixed sex conversations, and the interruptions and overlaps which occur. Men interrupt more than women and give less support and attention to women's words than to mens.

(5) Cheris Kramarae (1983) deals with women as speakers, and discusses the fact that women's words are largely ignored or devalued by historians.

(6) Douglas L. Romberg and Milton F. Shore (1986) found that for males and females participation in behavior perceived to be sex-role inappropriate plays a role in the fear of success.

(7) Jeffrey Lee Rasmussen and Barbara E. Moely (1986) studied the differences of perceptions in men's and women's language, and report that subjects rated males who spoke women's language as homosexual and tended to rate females who spoke men's language as uppity.

(8) Alice H. Eagly and Carole Chrvala (1986) examined status and gender role explanations of the tendency for women to conform more than men in group pressure settings. The analysis of age and sex differences revealed that older females conformed more than older

males when under surveillance and when subjects formed impressions of group members' likability.

(9) John E. Baird, Jr. (1976) in investigating differences in male and female behavior in group situations found that sex-role expectations are evident as female disclosure patterns are more affected by situational changes than are the behaviors of males. Baird feels this suggest females are more sensitive to their surroundings when revealing information about themselves than males. Baird also refers to past studies which revealed "males consistently tended to initiate activities while females acted in a respondent role," and "males used more words, talked more often, and, in mixed groups, interrupted females more frequently than females interrupted them."

Need For the Study

Feminists in the discipline of Rhetoric and Composition have joined the scholars in other fields in theoretical discussions of peer collaboration. And in those discussions, those feminists propose that participation in peer collaboration should improve the writing of female students. What is lacking in composition and is not lacking in sociolinquistics, etc. is the empirical research needed to verify those proposals.

Ann Lavine feels that composition theorists should

surprising that not one study has been conducted to investigage those concerns in composition. That is -- not one study until now. Chapter two describes the research design used in this study to investigate empirically the effects of peer collaboration on the writing of female composition students.

CHAPTER TWO

RESEARCH DESIGN

Project in Progress

In January 1987 a research project began in four freshman composition classes at the University of Oklahoma. The project was intended as a preliminary study to investigate the effectiveness of peer collaboration on the writing of female composition students as compared to male composition students. The controls used throughout the project were those recommended by George Hillocks in Research in Composition: A New Direction For Teaching for a credible research design (98-99), and those recommended by Charles Cooper in Evaluating Writing: Describing, Measuring, Judging (xi-20) for scoring the essays. Pages 28-30 depicts Hillocks' recommendations as applied to this study. In the following section regarding scoring and data, pages 36-38 reflect the guidelines which Cooper recommends and the method of scoring used in this project. In each case, the recommended guidelines are shown first and the particulars of this preliminary study follow.

HILLOCKS

(1)

There must be a comparison of one group of students receiving a specific treatment to a group of students receiving another treatment (98).

STUDY

(1)

An instructor with three years experience teaching composition taught two classes with a number as close to equal as possible of males and females using peer collaboration almost exclusively. This was designated the experimental group. Another instructor with two years teaching experience also taught two classes with an approximately equal number of males and females using teacher-lecture. This group was designated the control group. No peer collaboration entered into the control group classes during the study. Both instructors were female. The final count in the experimental group was twenty-three females and twenty males. The final count in the control group was fourteen females and thirteen males. As this was a preliminary study designed to discover if further research would be valuable in this area, the project was continued keeping in mind the difference in the size of the two treatments.

HILLOCKS

(2)

Hillocks also requires comparability. Subjects must be randomly assigned to treatments, and pre-tested and post-tested for writing ability (98).

STUDY

(2)

The classes were chosen at random except for the condition that each class must have a close to equal distribution of males and females. It was decided that the ratio would be no more than sixty percent of one sex and no less than forty percent of the other in each group. The students in this study were given a pre-test and post-test to compare their writing achievement within the two modes according to gender. This part of the research design was conducted over a three week period with the pre-test being given on the first day of the study, and the post-test on the last day.

HILLOCKS

(3)

Hillocks suggests controls of teacher variables. Neither of the instructors should be the experimenter. At least two instructors should teach each treatment, and there should be evidence that the treatments were in place throughout the term of the experiment (99).

STUDY

(3)

Because of the intent of this experimental preliminary study, only one instructor taught each treatment. Neither of the instructors was the experimenter. Both instructors

of the instructors was the experimenter. Both instructors were of the same sex, and both instructors' classes were observed by other experienced composition instructors, none of whom was the experimenter. The instructors who observed the treatments prepared written evaluations of each class stating that the treatments were in place. These evaluations are in Appendix A.

DAY TO DAY ACTIVITIES

These activities are presented so that treatments may be compared. The control group or teacher-lecture is first in each day's activities with the experimental group following.

DAY ONE CONTROL GROUP:

Students were asked to write an essay with the following prompt:

> You have fifty minutes to write and revise an essay responding to the statement "Language is power." You might want to consider advertisements, politicians' speeches, and/or other sources normally used in persuasion.

The assignment for the next class period was to read a section in the text, The Writer's Role, which discusses persuasion as it is used in language and as it is used specifically in advertisements and speeches.

DAY ONE EXPERIMENTAL:

Same as presentational.

DAY TWO CONTROL GROUP:

After a lecture by the instructor addressing dynamic, persuasive, and emotion-provoking language, as well as voice, audience, and style, the students were shown a tape of commercials. They were then asked to write their responses to the following questions or statements about each of the commercials:

(1). Who is the audience?

(2). Describe the style.

(3). Would you describe the language as dynamic? In what way?

(4). How would you change the ad?

(5). Describe the voice.

The instructor then lead a class discussion considering slogans and jingles in the text. Slogans and jingles used were examples of personification ("Nothin' says lovin' like somethin' from the oven, and Pillsbury says it best"), metaphors ("Put a tiger in your tank"), imagery ("Two all beef patties, special sauce, lettuce, cheese, pickles, onions on a sesame seed bun"), and sexual innuendo ("Flick My Bic!"). Other examples represented changes in time such as the

conservative fifties (Coke a "Sign of Good Taste"), the philosophical sixties (Coke is "The Real Thing"), the economical-conscious seventies ("Coke Adds Life"), and the competitive eighties ("Coke Is It").

For the next class period the students were asked to write a slogan for a real or imaginary product, and to read the section in their text which discusses the structure and style of advertisements. They were to answer the questions following that section.

DAY TWO EXPERIMENTAL GROUP:

The students were shown tapes of commercials after which they discussed the commercials in groups of three comprised of both males and females. They were asked to consider their reading assignment in the text dealing with dynamic, persuasive, and emotion-provoking language, as well as, voice, audience, and style. In the same groups they were asked to respond to the following questions or statements about the commercials:

(1). Who is the audience?

(2). Describe the style.

(3). Would you describe the language as dynamic? In what way?

(4). How would you change the ad?

(5). Describe the voice.

In the same groups the students were asked to discuss

Each group wrote a personal ad which was read and discussed by the whole class. The students were asked to read for their next class period the section in their text discussing the argumentative essay.

DAY FOUR CONTROL AND EXPERIMENTAL GROUPS:

Students in both classes were given fifty minutes to choose a subject from their outside reading and write a response to it. The subjects were "Cheating on Campus: Who's Really to Blame?", "TV Violence: The Shocking New Evidence," and "Active and Passive Euthanasia."

DAY FIVE CONTROL GROUP:

The instructor read several essays aloud to the class, and discussed language, voice, style, and audience. The students were told to take essays home and correct them according to elements of a good persuasion paper.

DAY FIVE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP:

The students were put into small groups and asked to read their essays to each other after which they were to make suggestions considering language, voice, style, and audience. The students were to rewrite essays considering suggestions by their group.

DAY SIX CONTROL GROUP:

The students were given the same prompt as on Day One

and were allowed fifty minutes to write and revise their responses.

DAY SIX EXPERIMENTAL GROUP:

Same as control group.

Scoring of Essays

The study produced 126 essays for scoring. Cooper suggest nine guidelines for a credible scoring of the essays with general impression marking (xi-20).

COOPER

(1)

The test must involve more than one sample per subject (1), composed on more than one occasion (2), under controlled circumstances (3) (19).

STUDY

(1)

The students were asked to write an in-class essay the first day of this study which was designated the pre-test. On the last day of this study the students again wrote an in-class essay which was designated the post-test. The prompt for the pre-test and the post-test was the following:

> You have fifty minutes to write and revise an essay in response to the statement "Language is Power." You might want to consider advertisements, politicians' speeches, and/or other sources normally used in

persuasion.

COOPER

(2)

The essay must reflect work in a single mode (personal narrative, explanation, dramatic dialogue, informative, expression) (xi), or work for different purposes (explanation, persuasion, expression) (xi), and it must be composed in response to a prompt with full rhetorical context (20).

STUDY

(2)

Both the pre-test and the post-test were persuasive essays written in response to the following prompt:

> You have fifty minutes to write and revise an essay in response to the statement "Language is Power." You might want to consider advertisements, politicians' speeches, and/or other sources normally used in persuasion.

COOPER

(3)

The scoring must be done by two or more raters (19) who use the full range of the rating scale (20). The raters must be tested for reliability until they achieve a reliability coefficient of 0.90 (18).

STUDY

(3)

of the pre-tests and post-tests for each group and combinations of groups. Table nine shows the standard deviations in the pre-tests and post-tests for all groups and combinations of groups, and table ten shows the mean differences in the groups. None of these tables show a statistically significant difference in the students' writing skills from pre-test to post-test, from control group to experimental group, or from male to female.

Summary

The results of the analysis of variance show that this study proves no statistically significant difference between the males and females in the teacher-lecture treatment and the peer collaboration treatment. However, the importance of this pilot study can be found in the slight gains and losses in the raw scores. An examination of the raw scores could be construed to support the theories of the feminists who support peer collaboration referred to in the review of the literature, however, as the raw scores are not statistically significant they cannot be considered proof. The raw scores for the experimental or peer collaboration treatment show an overall gain in writing skills for both the males and females combined. However, the gain is caused by the male students in the group as the females show a loss. The control or teacher-lecture treatment shows an overall loss, but the loss by the males students is considerably larger than that of the females. The female

considerably larger than that of the females. The female students show a loss in both treatments, but their loss is larger in the experimental or peer collaboration treatment.

Chapter four discusses the implications for further research in this study, and a research design which should produce statically significant data concerning the effectiveness of peer collaboration on the writing of female freshman composition students.

TABLE ONE

CONTROL OR TEACHER-LECTURE TREATMENT

FEMALES

GROUP C-R

RAW SCORES

RAW SCORES

Fourteen Subjects

Pre-Test Mean 4.43

Post-Test Mean 4.36

Mean Difference -0.07

PRE-TEST		POST-TEST	
Document #	Raw Score	Document #	Raw Score
6001	6.00	6031	6.00
6004	6.50	6037	4.00
6005	4.00	6036	5.50
6006	4.00	6038	4.50
6009	4.00	6039	4.50
6011	5.50	6057	4.50
6016	4.50	6058	2.50
6017	4.50	6041	4.00
6018	4.00	6043	5.00
6019	4.00	6055	4.00
6024	4.50	6047	4.50
6028	2.50	6042	4.00
6029	5.00	6045	4.00
6030	3.00	6052	4.00

TABLE TWO

CONTROL OR TEACHER-LECTURE TREATMENT

MALES

GROUP C-M

RAW SCORES

Thirteen Subjects

Pre-Test Mean 4.04

Post-Test Mean 4.08

Mean Difference 0.04

PRE-TEST		POST-TEST	
Document #	Raw Score	Document #	Raw Score
6002	4.00	6031	6.00
6003	3.50	6034	4.00
6008	4.50	6035	4.50
6010	4.00	6040	3.50
6012	2.50	6053	3.50
6013	3.50	6054	2.50
6014	5.50	6050	5.00
6015	4.00	6048	4.00
6020	5.00	6049	5.00
6021	5.00	6045	4.50
6022	4.50	6046	4.00
6023	4.50	6047	4.50
6025	2.00	6051	2.00

TABLE THREE

CONTROL OR TEACHER-LECTURE TREATMENT

GROUP C

RAW MEANS

Treatment Pre-Test Mean 4.24

Treatment Pos-Test Mean 4.22

Treatment Mean Difference -0.02

TABLE FOUR

PEER COLLABORATION OR EXPERIMENTAL TREATMENT

FEMALES

GROUP E-F

RAW SCORES

Twenty Subjects

Pre-Test Mean 4.10

Post-Test Mean 3.72

Mean Difference -0.38

PRE-TEST		POST-TEST	
Document #	Raw Score	Document #	Raw Score
5002	5.00	5089	5.00
5012	5.50	5076	2.00
5014	4.00	5091	4.00
5015	4.50	5075	3.50
5019	3.50	5079	3.50
5020	2.50	5088	2.50
5024	4.00	5051	5.50
5026	5.50	5053	4.00
5027	3.50	5050	4.50
5028	5.50	5055	3.50
5031	4.50	5049	4.50
5032	4.50	5048	3.50
5036	3.00	5061	3.50
5037	4.00	5052	4.50
5038	3.50	5056	4.00
5039	3.00	5063	3.50
5040	5.50	5062	4.00
5042	5.50	5070	3.50
5044	3.00	5067	3.00
5045	4.00	5069	3.00

TABLE FIVE

PEER COLLABORATION OR EXPERIMENTAL TREATMENT

MALES

GROUP E-M

RAW SCORES

Sixteen Subjects

Pre-Test Mean 4.03

Post-Test Mean 4.28

Mean Difference 0.25

PRE-TEST		POST-TEST	
Document #	Raw Score	Document #	Raw Score
5003	3.00	5087	2.50
5007	2.50	5084	4.00
5008	6.00	5077	6.50
5009	6.00	5083	5.50
5010	4.50	5081	4.50
5013	4.50	5072	3.50
5016	4.00	5090	4.50
5018	2.50	5085	3.00
5021	4.00	5086	3.50
5025	4.00	5059	5.00
5029	4.00	5060	4.50
5030	3.50	5058	4.00
5033	3.50	5068	5.50
5034	3.50	5071	4.00
5046	5.00	5066	3.50
5047	4.00	5065	4.50

TABLE SIX

PEER COLLABORATION OR EXPERIMENTAL TREATMENT

GROUP E

RAW MEANS

Pre-Test Mean 4.07

Post-Test Mean 3.97

Mean Difference 0.10

TABLE SEVEN

TOTAL TREATMENT

RAW MEANS

Pre-Test Mean	4.14
Post-Test Mean	4.09
Mean Difference	-0.05

TABLE EIGHT

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

MEAN

F - Females

M - Males

C - Teacher-lecture or control treatment

E - Peer collaboration or experimental Treatment

MEAN

	PRE-TEST	POST-TEST
GROUP E-F	4.20	3.75
GROUP E-M	4.03	4.28
GROUP C-F	4.43	4.35
GROUP C-M	4.04	4.07
GROUP E	4.13	3.98
GROUP C	4.24	4.22
GROUP F	4.29	4.00
GROUP M	4.03	4.18

TABLE NINE

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

STANDARD DEVIATION

F - Females

M - Males

C - Teacher-lecture treatment

E - Peer collaboration treatment

	STANDARD DEVIATION	
	PRE-TEST	POST-TEST
GROUP E-F	0.97	0.82
GROUP E-M	1.02	1.02
GROUP C-F	1.07	0.81
GROUP C-M	0.98	1.05
GROUP E	0.98	0.94
GROUP C	1.03	0.93
GROUP F	1.01	0.86
GROUP M	0.90	1.02

TABLE TEN

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

MEAN DIFFERENCE

F - Females

M - Males

C - Teacher-lecture treatment

E - Peer collaboration treatment

	MEAN DIFFERENCE
GROUP E-F	-0.45
GROUP C-F	-0.07
GROUP E-M	0.25
GROUP C-M	0.04

All Groups Analysis of Variance Mean Difference -0.09

CHAPTER FOUR

CONCLUSIONS

Implications For Further Study

Although this pilot study is not statistically significant, when considered along with the five other studies discussed in the review of the literature which address gender, its argument becomes stronger especially for those teachers concerned about the effects of peer collaboration on the writing of their students. It is also significant that the entire peer collaboration treatment in this study shows a gain in writing skills while the teacher-lecture treatment shows a loss. This result seems to favor the theory articulated by feminists Goulston and Stanger that peer collaboration is effective in teaching writing, and that females contribute to that effectiveness as they are accustomed to compromise and to attending to others' needs, a necessity in any kind of group work.

However, as the females show a loss in the peer collaboration treatment it is entirely possible that if females are contributing to the effectiveness of peer

collaboration groups in writing classes it may not be to their benefit, and could be at their expense. Of the other two studies mentioned previously in which females in peer collaboration groups showed a gain, one was rated by open-ended primary trait scoring which does not directly rate overall writing improvement. Therefore, this study and four of the only five studies discussed in the review of the literature which address gender and peer collaboration as it affects female students' writing skills, and which were scored for overall writing improvement do not agree with the suggestions of Goulston and Stanger. They do appear to agree with the statements by Ann Lavine summarized earlier as she questions the effectiveness of peer collaboration for female students when their "thoughts are interrupted," and their "topics are ignored" by males in collaborative groups. It is entirely possible that the only solution to this controversy is a larger study of longer duration and with tighter controls such as the one proposed below.

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF PEER COLLABORATION ON THE WRITING OF FEMALE COMPOSITION STUDENTS

I. Subjects -- First semester freshmen

The subjects should be male and female composition students enrolled in sixteen sections.

Eight sections will participate in the peer

collaboration treatment, and eight sections will participate in the teacher-lecture treatment.

There will be no grouping in the teacher-lecture treatment.

The subjects in the peer collaboration treatment will be assigned to groups of three. The groups within each section will consist of two groups of three males, two groups of two males and one female, two groups of one male and two females, and two groups of three females.

II. Instructors -- graduate teaching assistants with at least two semesters teaching experience

The instructors should be four males and four females each teaching the teacher-lecture treatment in one section and the peer collaboration treatment in the other section.

Two males and two females will team teach their eight sections which will test the importance of the sex of the instructor.

To assure the treatments are in place, each instructor will be observed six times by composition instructors who are not otherwise a part of the study.

III. Treatments

The two treatments should be peer collaboration and teacher-lecture with the sub-treatments as follows:

(1) Peer collaboration-- students -- three males

(2) Peer collaboration -- students -- two males, one female

(3) Peer collaboration -- students -- one male, two females

(4) Peer collaboration -- students -- three females

(5) Peer collaboration -- instructors -- male and female

(6) Teacher lecture -- instructors -- male and female

(7) Peer collaboration -- instructors -- male

(8) Peer collaboration-- instructors -- female

(9) Teacher lecture-- instructors -- male

(10) Teacher lecture -- instructors -- female

III. Length -- six weeks

IV. Method of Comparison

The students in all sixteen sections should be given a pre-test early in the study, and a post-test on the last day of the study providing a comparison.

V. Criteria

Students should be provided with specific criteria for writing a persuasive paper before the post-test. The prompt for both the pre-test and the post-test should provide a full rhetorical context with careful

consideration for possible connotations regarding gender.

VI. Scoring

The essays should be scored by at least one male and one female who have been trained to score primary trait marking, and who have reached a reliability coefficient of 0.90 using anchors from the study.

VI. Primary Data -- pre-test and post-test

VII. Secondary Data -- survey

All students in both treatments will be given a survey sheet. This sheet should be designed in such a way as to generate information on student reaction to the two treatments, the groups within the environmental treatments, and the sex of the instructors.

Conclusions

This study titled "The Effectiveness of Peer Collaboration on the Writing of Female Freshman Composition Students: A Preliminary Study" did not provide statistically significant evidence. It did provide, however, one more study which questions peer collaboration as an effective teaching tool especially as it affects female students. In addition, this study served to

highlight the need for further investigation of female students' writing as it is affected by peer collaboration. More important, it served as a pilot study for a more complex and more carefully controlled research design which could provide valuable information for those teachers interested in the effect peer collaboration has on the writing of female students.

APPENDIX A

WRITTEN OBSERVATIONS OF ENVIRONMENTAL TREATMENT

January 15, 1988

The instructor showed a video of recent commercials including ones from McDonalds, Burger King, Coke, Pepsi, etc. The students discussed the commercials in groups of three for ten minutes. Then each group gave a brief presentation to the class discussing the commercials, analyzing the connotations and symbols, and fielding questions and comments from the other students and the instructor. The students with prompting from the instructor discussed tone, voice, and audience.

The students were then assigned to read for the next class period a section in the text dealing with slogans and jingles.

January 18, 1988

In groups the students discussed slogans and jingles from their reading assignment. The entire class discussed the assignment as it related to tone, style, and audience.

In new groups the students worked together to write a slogan or jingle which they presented in class. The students discussed the slogans and jingles after they were presented.

The instructor assigned a reading assignment and a personal ad due the next class period.

January 22, 1988

The students read and discussed their ads in groups. They chose the most persuasive essay in each group, and read it to the whole class. The class seemed to have a great time with this assignment.

The instructor assigned a section in the text for the students to read. They were to write a response to the reading.

WRITTEN OBSERVATION OF PRESENTATIONAL TREATMENT

January 15, 1988

The instructor showed the class a tape of recent commercials from McDonalds, Burger King, and several others. The instructor then led a class discussions about the appropriateness of the taped commercials concentrating on audience, voice, tone and style.
After the discussion the instructor gave a reading assignment in the text for the next class period.

January 18, 1988

The teacher lectured on elements of persuasion including tone, style, and audience appeal. The instructor

asked the students to comment on the slogans and jingles in their reading assigned as they related to the lecture.

The students were assigned to write a slogan or a jingle in class. After about ten minutes, the instructor read some of the students' slogans and jingles aloud, and discussed their use of tone, voice and audience appeal. The instructor assigned a section in the text for the students to read for the next class, and assigned a personal ad as a writing assignment.

January 22, 1988

The instructor read several of the personal ads aloud to the class, and led in a class discussion of the persuasive quality of the ads. Some of the personal ads were quite amusing, and the students seemed to enjoy this activity. The students made suggestions for more persuasive ads. The students rewrote their ads in class. They handed them in as they finished.

The instructor wrote the assignment for the next class period on the blackboard.

APPENDIX B

SAMPLE ANCHORS

ANCHOR ESSAY: SAMPLE OF A TWO

445-80-1041

27

Language is Power

In the world of commercial advertising the power of language is very important. Not only by the way they speak but also by their actions).

As in a commercial for Minute Maid orange juice the language is used differently to catch the attention ~~of~~ all types of viewers). The commercial is meant to appeal ~~to~~ to the parent first. Giving it to

405-80-1041

nutritional value. Later in the commercial it shows a picture of a little boy playing basketball with his father. The boy and his father are standing back to back and the father is drinking the orange juice. The boy in turn wants a glass because he feels the orange juice will make his big and tall like his dad.

ANCHOR ESSAY: SAMPLE OF A THREE

440-86-0477
5011

Language is Power

Language is the most powerful communication we have. In tone of your voice says several different things. One thing it says is how much authority you have. Another is how you feel about yourself, are you aggressive or shy.

One good example how the power of language is used is commercials. In way they talk about products on commercials encourages you to buy them. It isn't just what they say but how they say it that makes you want to buy their product. You may use a soft voice for kleenex and an energetic voice for soap. A soft voice would work better than a moron voice for kleenex, making you think the kleenex is soft. While an energetic voice would be better than

4KD-86-0477

a soft voice for soap, so you will think it bores you up. If the ducks talk like that then you might not be as interested in their product.

Language is powerful in many different ways and for many different reasons.

ANCHOR ESSAY: SAMPLE OF A FOUR

21

448-84-2008

Language is power

The person selling a certain product in a televirsion commercial has the power to make the persons watching want to buy the product. He describes exactly what it can do for you by using catchy phrases or songs that stick in your mind. A person can enter a store and see something on a shelf, what he sees automatically makes him think of the song or phrase and he buys the product.

448-84-2008

Men and women in the political field also use language as power. They write campaign speeches that promise the world. In doing this they make the voters think they are the perfect person to fill the office they are running for. Their speches are also catchy, like commercials, and when people hear things that they want to hear, they'll remember that person and vote for them. Some Evangalists use their language power in order to get wealth and

448-84-2008

fame. Their firey sermons convince the people who follow them to send in the money they want. Most take advantage of their title and use it only to get money, they are not sincere in their beliefs and use their power [redacted] in the wrong kind of way.

ANCHOR ESSAY: SAMPLE OF A FIVE

443-86-C433

5

"Language is Power"

The phrase "Language is Power" can be taken many different ways. In fact I believe it means many different things to different people. The first interpretation could be that the number of languages you speak may give you a lack of knowledge, and many people believe that with knowledge comes power or greatness. Another interpretation could be the usage of the language you speak could show how much authority or power you have. Also the tone of your voice at when

443-86-0437

speaking could show your persuasiveness or authority

The first interpretation of the phrase, "Language is power," could be that the number of languages you speak could give you power in certain situations. When you are at least bilingual people tend to think you are a world traveler. People also think that world travelers are very smart. The more languages you speak - the smarter you are. Knowledge is linked to power as

443-86-0433

authority. Perhaps you are in a foreign country on a tour with Americans and you speak the language but most of the other Americans do not. This gives you a superiority or power over the others. This is one example of how this phrase can be interpreted.

The usage of language is another interpretation of the phrase "Language is Power." Say that you are a very quiet type of person and rarely speak unless asked a question

443-26-0433

you do not show any authority and do not stand up for yourself This is hardly showing power. But, if you are very bold and speak up for yourself, join in discussions, without being asked, and state your opinion whether others are opposed or not, then this shows great leadership and power. This must be done in a fashion which is not rude but polite to others yet still bold. If not you will seem as a tyrant

H43-86-0437

instead of a powerful leader.

Yet another example of an interpretation of the phrase, "Language is power," is the tone of voice in which one speaks a language is important. One with a quiet, shy voice shows no power but weakness. One yet one with a loud, bold voice shows much power. One thing included here is the power of persuasion. A persuasive voice is very important and if used properly can be very successful

443-86-0433

And show you great power.

In these three examples I have shown how knowledge, leadership and persuasion can be linked to power through language. These are only a few of the many interpretations of the phrase, "Language is power," and the others are probably very interesting and useful to those seeking power.

ANCHOR ESSAY: SAMPLE OF A SIX

447 629610 2*

"Language is Power."

Language is power, because we have given it power and continue to give it power everyday. If people had never communicated, even through symbols or drawings, there would be no language today. Yet language is a necessary and vital part of the world today. Language has the power to entice (sp?), enhance and persuade people through the meanings, (the power) it has been given.

In everyday life people run into power any form of it, atleast

447-62-9610 :

a hundred times a day Through speech, comercials, or friends, the power of language is seen every-day.

As seen in advertising the power is used to persuade and entice the reader to go somewhere, buy something, or eat this and that. Colorful words are choosen to start the readers mind, then attention-getters are thrown in to make sure they buy the products. The power seen in these articles (ads) has been given to the advertiser

by the people.

Throughout time words have been placed in several categories. There are words that mean love, hate, serenity; words that have a sense of peace, joy, love or fear. This power has been given to the words and in some situations makes them almost dangerous.

As seen in Hitler's reign over Europe, people gave him the power of speech which in turn alienated a whole ethnic race and almost destroyed the

447-62-9610

world.

Another good example of "word-power" would be the word "love". Everyone is taught to love their neighbors, to have a sense of brotherly love for everyone... etc. Yet, in many relationships the word is so powerful it scares people. Many find it hard to tell others "I love you" because that word has been given so much power it scares some away.

Many words also have

[redacted] 447624961C)

-5-

several meanings which may seem to appear less authoritie then others. The word "power" for instance can mean to rule over which gives some-one great strength, but if it means authoritive it doesn't have as much pull.

Therefore in summing it up: words do have great power over everyone. Yet, even the most powerful word to one person may mean hardly anything to another. This proves that language does have power, but the power is

-6-

at different levels, to each different person, and can effect anyone differently than others

ANCHOR ESSAY: SAMPLE OF A SEVEN

491-80-0060

"LANGUAGE IS POWER" IS MORE THAN JUST A SAYING. IT IS A TRUTH. THE WORDS (OF FAMOUS MEN IN HISTORY) LIVE LONGER THAN THEIR ACTIONS. NOTHING CAN MOVE MEN MORE THAN THE WORDS OF ANOTHER MAN. LANGUAGE IS THE MOST POWERFUL TOOL MAN HAS AT HIS DISPOSAL.

IN A BASIC SENSE, LANGUAGE IS ESSENTIAL TO MANKIND. WITHOUT LANGUAGE WE NEVER COULD HAVE EVOLVED INTO THE THINKING, CREATIVE BEINGS WE ARE. LANGUAGE ALLOWS US TO COMMUNICATE WHICH IS ESSENTIAL TO OUR MENTAL (AND PHYSICAL) WELLBEING. WITH LANGUAGE, MEN HAVE COME TOGETHER THROUGH THE AGES AND SHARED THOUGHTS AND IDEAS WHICH HAVE BROUGHT ABOUT EVERY ADVANCEMENT AND INVENTION ON THIS EARTH. THROUGH LANGUAGE, THIS KNOWLEDGE IS THEN PASSED ON TO THE

1/91-80-0063

FOLLOWING GENERATIONS WHO USE THIS (KNOWLEDGE) AS BUILDING BLOCKS FOR THE THINGS THEY WILL LEARN ABOUT THE UNIVERSE.

THERE HAVE BEEN MANY FAMOUS MEN; FAMOUS FOR THE GOOD DEEDS THEY ACCOMPLISHED AND FOR THEIR IDEAS. HOWEVER, THE IDEAS ARE REMEMBERED AFTER THE ~~DEEDS~~ ACCOMPLISHMENTS FADE INTO THE DUSTY CORNERS OF HISTORY. FOR EXAMPLE, MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. DID MANY GREAT THINGS TO HELP FIGHT RACISM, BUT THE IDEAS STILL LIVE BECAUSE THE GOAL HAS NOT YET BEEN OBTAINED. IF ONE ~~HEARS~~ HEARS "I HAVE A DREAM..." HE IMMEDIATELY ASSOCIATES THE WORDS TO THE MAN. THE IDEAS AND DREAMS (IN THE FORM OF LANGUAGE) ARE THE "FOOT-PRINTS" LEFT BEHIND.

NOTHING CAN MOVE MEN MORE THAN THE WORDS OF ANOTHER MAN. NO MATTER WHAT WONDERFUL

491-80-5060

OR TERRIBLE) THINGS MAN CAN ACCOMPLISH, THERE IS ALWAYS THAT WHICH IS "OUT OF REACH". IN THIS WORLD, "OUT OF REACH" ARE THE IDEALS, HOPES, AND DREAMS OF MANKIND. THINGS WE HAVE NOT YET OBTAINED ARE LOVE, THE ABOLISHMENT OF POVERTY, HUNGER, SUFFERING, ETC. FOR NOW THESE THINGS ARE MERELY DREAMS, BUT THEY ARE DREAMS SHARED BY MANY MEN. WHEN THESE IDEALS ARE EXPRESSED THROUGH LANGUAGE, WE ARE CAPTIVATED. NOTHING WE CAN DO HAS THE POWER TO TOUCH US LIKE THE THINGS WE CANNOT (AS OF YET) DO. LANGUAGE IS THE FIRST STEP TO ACCOMPLISHING THESE GOALS.

ANCHOR ESSAY: SAMPLE OF AN EIGHT

445-54-9342
N
5078

Language is Power

Language is a tool that has evolved from a crude form of communicating into a highly-technical form of mass media. The ability to sway public opinion and the act of doing so creates a powerful world that can make our existence enlightening or very possibly highly controlled.

The power of the word has made nations topple, corporations dictate world policies and individuals into overnight successes. The spoken or written word has became a means by which to rule such unimportant domains as the name to the world at large.

--- As americans, we believe in our constitution - written as a means to govern us in a free, democratic fashion. The rights we have to free speech make us open to many forms of language and propaganda.

Newspapers, books, magazines and television are all media methods of expression. They also create "big business" which creates "big money" which, in turn, creates "big power."

The "big power" created by this can influence how we dress, what we buy, how we entertain ourselves and even how we speak and think.

The freedom of speech has evolved

445-54-9342
N

-from having the simple right to have an opinion to almost having no opinion of your own at all. It should make us compare today's world with pre-revolutionary lack of free choice and will.

The purpose of having freedoms in the media is not to dictate, but instead to educate, offer alternative thoughts, keep aware and abreast of current events.

It is very important to take the role of the wary, yet open-minded communicator. Language is a gift, a means by which to make an important difference in the way we live in the world. It can change our lives from a mere existence into an interesting, informed life-experience

ABBREVIATIONS FOR PERIODICALS

College English	CE
College Composition and Communication	CCC
Dissertation Abstracts International	DAI
English Journal	EJ
National Council of Teachers of English	NCTE
Sex Roles	SR
Teaching English in the Two-Year College	TETYC
Written Composition	WC

WORKS CONSULTED

Allister, Mark. "The Art of Teaching Writing: A Description of Four Approaches." Journal of Teaching Writing 5 (1986): 351-361.

Beach, Richard, and Lillian S. Bridwell, eds. New Directions in Composition Research. New York: Guilford Press, 1984.

Bereiter, Carl and Marlene Scardamalia. "Levels of Inquiry in Writing Research." Directions in Technical Writing and Communication. J.R. Gould, ed. vol 1. Farmingdale, New York: Baywood Publishing, 1978, 3-25.

Berryman, Cynthia L. and Virginia A. Eman, eds. Communication, Language, and Sex. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House Publishers, 1980.

Bizzell, Patricia. "Thomas Kuhn, Scientism, and English Studies." CE 40 (1979): 764-71.

Bizzell, Patricia and Bruce Herzberg. The Bedford Bibliography for Teachers of Writing. Boston: St. Martin's Press, 1987.

Booth, T.Y. "I.A. Richards and the Composing Process." CCC 37 (1986): 453-465.

Brooke, Robert. "Lacan, Transference, and Writing Instruction." CE 49 (1987): 679-691.

Bruffee, Kenneth A. "Collaborative Learning and the 'Conversation of Mankind.'" CE 48 (1984): 635-652.

---. " The Art of Collaborative Learning: Making the Most of Knowledgeable Peers." Change 19 (1987): 42-47.

Burke, Kenneth. A Rhetoric of Motives. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1950.

Carney, Clarke G., et al. "Dealing with Sex Roles in Groups: A Developmental Approach." Journal for Specialists in Group Work. 11.4 (1986): 194-199.

Chapman, David W. "Conflict and Consensus: How Composition Scholars View Their Discipline." ADE Bulletin 87 Washington D.C.: GPO, 1987.

Chase, Geoffrey. "Accommodation, Resistance and the Politics of Student Writing." CCC 39 (1988): 13-22.

Connors, Robert J. "The Rise and Fall of the Modes of Discourse." CCC, 32 (1981), 444-463.

Connors, Robert J., Lisa S. Ede, and Andrea A. Lunsford, eds. Essays on Classical Rhetoric and Modern Discourse. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois U. P., 1984.

Cooper, Charles Rl, and Lee Odell, eds. Research on Composing: Points of Departure. Urbana, IL: NCTE, 1978.

Cooper, Charles R., and Sidney Greenbaum, eds. Studying Writing: Linguistic Approaches. vol 1. London: Sage Publications, 1986.

Corbett, Edward P.J. "Teaching Composition: Where We've Been and Where We're Going." CCC 38 (1987): 445-452.

---. Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student. 2nd ed. New York: Oxford U. P., 1971.

Dasenbrock, Reed Way. "J. L. Austin and the Articulation of a New Rhetoric." CCC 38 (1987): 291-305.

Dobbins, Gregory H. "Equity vs. Equality: Sex Differences in Leadership." SR. 15.9 (1986): 513-525.

Elbow, Peter. Writing Without Teachers. New York: Oxford U. P., 1973.

Emig, Janet. The Web of Meaning: Essays on Writing, Teaching, Learning, and Thinking. Eds., Dixie Goswami, and Maureen Butler. Upper Montclair, NJ: Boynton/Cook, 1983.

Farris, Christine R. "Current Composition Beyond Process vs. Product." EJ 76 (1987): 28-34.

Flower, Linda, and John R. Hayes. "A Cognitive Process Theory of Writing." CCC 32 (1981): 365-387.

---. "Response to Cooper and Holzman, 'Talking about Protocols.' CCC 34 (1983): 284-293." CCC 36 (1985): 94-100.

Flower, Linda. Problem-Solving Strategies for Writing. 2nd ed. New York: Harcourt, 1985.

Flynn, Elizabeth. "Students as Readers of Their Classmates' Writing: Some Implications for Peer Critiquing." Writing Instructor. 3 (1984): 120-128.

Gannett, Cinthia Lee. Gender and Journals: Life and Text in College Composition. Diss. DAI 48 (1988): 1680A. U. of New Hampshire.

Gere, Anne Ruggles. Writing Groups: History, Theory, and Implication. Carbondale, IL: Southern IL. U. P., 1987.

Graves, D.H. "Sex Differences in Children's Writing." Elementary English 50 (1973): 1101-1106.

Grimm, Nancy. "Improving Students' Responses to Their Peers' Essays." CCC 37 (1986): 91-94.

Hairston, Maxine. "Different Products, Different Processes: A Theory About Writing." CCC 38 (1986): 442-444.

Harris, Joseph. Rev. of Perspectives on Research and Scholarship in Composition, ed. Ben W. McClelland and Timothy R. Donovan. CCC 38 (1987): 101-102.

Hawkins, Thomas. Group Inquiry Techniques for Teaching Writing. Urbana, IL.: NCTE, 1976.

Heibrun, Alfred B., Jr., and Becky Bailey. "Independence of Masculine and Feminine Traits: Empirical Exploration of a Prevailing Assumption." SR 14 (1986): 105-122.

---. Androgyny as Type and Androgyny as Behavior: Implications for Gender Schema in Males and Females." SR 14 (1986): 123-139.

Hogan, Pat. "Peer Editing Helps Students Improve Written Products." Highway One 7 (1984): 51-54.

Horner, Winifred Bryan, ed. Historical Rhetoric: An Annotated Bibliography of Selected Sources in English.

Boston: G.K. Hall, 1980.

---. The Present State of Scholarship in Historical and Contemporary Rhetoric. Columbia, MO: U. of Missouri P., 1983.

Johannesen, Richard L., ed. Contemporary Theories of Rhetoric: Selected Readings. New York: Harper, 1971.

Key, Mary Ritchie. Male/Female Language. Metuchen, N.J.: The Scarecrow Press, 1975.

Kinneavy, James L. A Theory of Discourse. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1971; rpt. New York: Norton, 1980.

Labov, William. Sociolinguistic Patterns. Philadelphia: U. of Penn. P., 1972.

LaFrance, Marianne and Clara Mayo. "A Review of Nonverbal Behaviors of Women and Men." Webster Journal of Speech Communication. 43 (1979): 96-107.

Larson, Richard. Rev. Research on Written Composition: New Directions for Teaching by George Hillocks, Jr. CCC 38 (1987): 207-213.

---, ed. "Selected Bibliography of Scholarship on Composition and Rhetoric, 1986." CCC 38 (1987): 319-336.

Lynn, Steven. "Reading the Writing Process: Toward a Theory of Current Pedagogies." CE 49 (1987): 902-910.

Masiello, Lea. Writing in Action: A Collaborative Rhetoric for College Writers. New York: Macmillan,

1986.

McClelland, Ben W. and Timothy R. Donovan, eds. Perspectives in Research and Scholarship in Composition. New York: MLA, 1985.

Murphy, James J., ed. The Rhetorical Tradition and Modern Writing. New York: MLA, 1982.

Myers, Greg. "Reality, Consensus, and Reform in the Rhetoric of Composition Teaching." CE 48 (1986): 154-174.

Odell, Lee. "Diversity and Change: Toward a Maturing Discipline." CCC 37 (1986): 395-397.

Olson, David R., Nancy Torrance, and Angela Hildyard. Literacy, Language, and Learning. New York: Cambridge U. P., 1985.

O'Sullivan, Maurice J. "The Group Journal." Journal of General Education 38 (1987): 288-300.

Putnam, Linda L. and Linda McAllister. "Situational Effects of Task and Gender on Nonverbal Display." Dan Minno, ed. Communication Yearbook. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Books, 1980. 679-697.

Richards, I. A. The Philosophy of Rhetoric. New York: Oxford U. P., 1936. rpt., 1981.

Scott, Patrick, and Bruce Castner. "Reference Sources for Composition Research: A Practical Survey." CE 45 (1983): 756-758.

Smith, Philip M. Language, the Sexes and Society. New

York: Basil Blackwell, Inc., 1985.

Sommers, Nancy. "Responding to Student Writing." CCC 32 (1982): 148-156.

Stewart, Lea P., and Stella Ting-Toomey, eds. Communication, Gender, and Sex Roles in Diverse Interaction Contexts. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex Publishing, 1987.

Swift, Patricia W. The Effect of Peer Review with Self-Evaluation on Freshman Writing Performance, Retention, and Attitude at Broward Community College. Diss. DAI 47 (1987): 3653A. Florida Atlantic U.

Tarvers, Josephine Koster. Teaching Writing: Theories and Practices. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman, 1988.

Welch, Kathleen E. "Idealogy and Freshman Textbook Production: The Place of Theory in Writing Pedagogy." CCC 37 (1987): 269-282.

Witte, Stephen P., and Roger D. Cherry. "Writing Processes and Written Products." Studying Writing: Linguistic Approaches. London: Sage Publications, 1986, 112-153.

Wolcott, Willa. "Writing Instruction and Assessment: The Need for Interplay between Process and Product." CCC 38 (1987): 40-46.

WORKS CITED

Baird, John E. Jr. "Sex Differences in Group Communication: A Review of Relevant Research." Quarterly Journal of Speech 62 (1976): 179-181.

Beard, John David. Toward a Rationale for Analyzing Writing in Peer Groups. Diss. U of Michigan, 1979. DAI 7925096.

Benesch, Sarah. "Improving Peer Response: Collaboration between Teachers and Students." Journal of Teaching Writing. 4 (1985): 87-94.

---. Peer Group Talk About Early Drafts: A Case Study of Three Freshman Writers. Diss. DAI 46 (1986): 3634A. New York U.

Berkenhotter, Carol. "Student Writers and Their Sense of Authority Over Texas," CCC 35 (1984): 312-319.

Boss, Roberta S. Peer Group Critiques in Formative Evaluation of College Composition. Diss. U of Maryland, 1986. DAI 8620746.

Bouton, Kathleen, and Gary Tutty. "The Effect of Peer-Evaluated Student Compositions on Writing Improvement." English Record Fall (1975): 64-67.

Braddock, Richard, Richard Lloyd-Jones, and Lowell Shoer. Research in Written Composition. Urbana, IL: NCTE,

1963.

Brown, Jane L. "Helping Students Help Themselves: Peer Evaluation of Writing." Curriculum Review 23 (1984): 47-50.

Bruffee, Kenneth A. "The Brooklyn Plan: Attaining Intellectual Growth through Peer-Group Tutoring." Liberal Education 64 (1978): 447-469.

Cavanaugh, Gray, and Ken Styles. "Evaluating Written Work." English Quarterly 16 (1983): 63-68.

Caywood, Cynthia L., and Gillian R. Overing, eds. Teaching Writing: Pedagogy, Gender, and Equity. Albany: State U of New York P, 1987.

Clifford, John Patrick. "An Experimental Inquiry into the Effectiveness of Collaborative Learning as a Method for Improving the Experiential Writing Performance of College Freshmen in a Remedial Writing Class." Diss. New York U, 1980. DAI 405299A.

Coates, Jennifer. Women, Men, and Language. New York: Longman, 1986.

Cooper, Alan. "Daily Writing for Peer Response." CCC 37 (1986): 346-348.

"Cooperative Learning in the Urban Classroom." Equity and Choice. 3.2 (1987): 15-18.

Cooper, Charles R., and Lee Odell, eds. Evaluating Writing: Describing, Measuring, Judging. Urbana, IL: NCTE, 1977.

Craig, Barbara Joy. Oral Response Groups Before and After Rough Drafts: Effects on Writing Achievement and Apprehension. Diss. Ohio U, 1981. DAI 801445.

Danis Mary Francine. Peer-Response Groups in a College Writing Workshop: Students' Suggestions for Revising Compositions. Diss. Michigan State U, 1980. DAI 8112066.

DeCiccio, Albert C. Social Constructionism and Collaborative Learning: The Implications for Rhetoric and Composition. Diss. DAI 48 (1988): 1679A. Arizona State U.

Degroff, Linda J. The Relationship of Prior Knowledge to the Texts and Peer Conference Comments in Process-Approach Lessons. Diss. Syracuse U, 1985. DAI 8603755.

Duin, Ann Hill. "Implementing Cooperative Learning Groups in the Writing Curriculum." Journal of Teaching Writing 5 (1986): 315-323.

Eagly, Alice H. and Carole Chrvala. "Sex Differences in Conformity: Status and Gender Role Interpretations." Psychology of Women Quarterly 10.3 (1986): 203-220.

Farrell, Kevin James. A Comparison of Three Instructional Approaches to Teaching Written Composition to High School Juniors: Teacher Lecture, Peer Evaluation, and Group Tutoring. Diss. DAI 38 (1977): 1849A. Boston U.

Finn, Jacqueline L. Analysis of the Peer Conference of Upper Elementary Writers. Diss. U of Massachusetts, 1985. DAI 8509544.

Fishman, Pamela M. "Interaction: The Work Women Do." Thorne 89-101.

Flanigan Michael C. "Collaborative Composition Research at Oklahoma: Everybody Benefits -- the Students, Teachers, Graduate Students, Faculty Researchers, and the institution." Panel on Replicating Significant Research. CCCC. Seattle, Washington, 1989.

Flynn, James H., III. and Dwight A. Williams, Jr. "The Unstructured Group in the Interpersonal Communication Course." Central State Speech Journal 28.1 (1976): 37-41.

Forbes, Christopher J. "Developing Editing Skills in the Beginning Technical Writing Class." Technical Writing Teacher 13 (1986): 122-134.

Ford, Bob Wayne. The Effects of Peer Editing/Grading on the Grammar-Usage and Theme-Composition Ability of College Freshman. Diss. DAI 20 (1973): 6687A. U of Oklahoma.

Gilligan, Carol. In A Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Woman's Development. Cambridge, MA: Harvard U P, 1982.

Goulston, Wendy. "Women Writing." Caywood 19-31.

Graner, Michael H. Revision Techniques: Peer Editing and

the Revision Workshop. Diss. DAI 47 (1986): 109A. U of Connecticut.

Hansen, Jane. "Authors Respond to Authors." Language Arts 60 (1983): 970-976.

Hillocks, George Jr. Research on Written Composition: New Directions for Teaching. Urbana, IL: NCRE, 1986.

Jordan, Mary K. The Effects of Cooperative Peer Review on College Students Enrolled in Required Advanced Technical Writing Courses." Diss. DAI 45 (1984): 1319A. U of Maryland.

Katstra, Joyce. "The Effects of Peer Evaluation on Attitude toward Writing and Writing Fluency of Ninth Grade Students." Journal of Educational Research 80 (1987): 168-172.

Kelly, Patricia. "Composition through the Team Approach." EJ 73 (1984): 71-74.

King, Bonnie Jean McKenzie. Peer and Teacher Evaluation: A Comparison of Eleventh Grade Students. Diss. DAI 42 (1982): 2998A. U of Kansas.

Kleine, Michael. "What Freshmen Say--and Might Say--to Each Other About Their Own Writing." Journal of Teaching Writing. 4 (1985): 216-233.

Kramarae, Cheris. Women and Men Speaking. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House Publishers, 1981.

Lavine, Ann. "Subject Matter and Gender." Caywood 135-147.

Lyons, William David. The Effects of Teacher-Peer Response

and Teacher-Only Response Upon Attitudes Toward Writing, and Upon Writing Performance. Diss. U. of Missouri-Columbia, 1976. DAI 7715530. Mair, David. "Replicating Significant Composition Research: Reconstructing Old Knowledge to Create New." CCCC. Seattle, Washington, 1989.

Mclaughlin, Margaret and Ruth Fennick. "Collaborative Writing: Student Interaction and Response." TETYC 14 (1987): 214-216.

McManus, Martha V. A Study of Peer Response Groups in a Tenth Grade Writing Class. Diss. U of Georgia, 1986. DAI 8628897.

Meeks, Lynn L. Developing the Internal Editor: Peer Revision in a Third Grade Class. Diss. Arizona State U, 1985. DAI 8528764.

Myers, Charles Frederick. Teacher and Peer Evaluative Feedback in the Development of Two Composition Skills: Punctuation Paragraph Unity. Diss. St. John's U, 1979. DAI 7920953.

Myers, Greg. "Reality, Consensus, and Reform in the Rhetoric of Composition Teaching." CE 48 (1986): 154-174.

Newkirk, Thomas. "Direction and Misdirection in Peer Response." CCC 35 (1984): 301-311.

---. "How Students Read Student Papers: An Exploratory Study." WC 1 (1984): 283-305.

O'Donnell, Angela M. "Cooperative Writing: Direct Effects and Transfer." WC 2 (1985): 307-315.

---. "Effects of Cooperative and Individual Rewriting on an Instruction Writing Task." WC 4 (1987): 90-99.

Owen, Heleen. "Cooperative Classrooms: Implementing Cooperative Learning: One District's Experience." Equity and Choice. 3.2 (1987): 19-26.

Penfield, Elizabeth and Nancy Wicker. The Writer's Roles. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman and Co., 1985.

Petty, Shirley J. The Influence of Peer Response Groups Upon Eighth Grade Writers. Diss. Arizona State U, 1986. DAI 8702944.

Piazza, Carolyn, and Carl M. Tomlinson. "A Concert of Writers." Language Arts 62 (1985): 150-158.

Pilarcik, Marlene A. "Tools for the Classroom: Creative Writing as a Group Effort." Unterrichtspraxis. 19.2 (1986): 220-224.

Pomerenke, Paula J. "Rewriting and Peer Evaluation: A Positive Approach for Business Writing Classes." ABCA Bulletin 47 (1984): 33-36.

Rasmussen, Jeffrey Lee, and Barbara E. Moely. "Impression Formation as a Function of the Sex Role Appropriateness of Linguistic Behavior." SR 14 (1986): 149-161.

Reynolds, John Frederick. "The Effect of Collaborative Peer Revision Groups on Audience-Consciousness in the

Writing of College Freshman." Diss. U. of Oklahoma, 1987.

Roberts, William H. The Effects of Grammar Reviews and Peer- Editing on Selected Collegiate Students' Ability to Write Business Letters Correctly. Diss. Oklahoma State U, 1985. DAI 8611561.

Romberg, Douglas L, and Milton F. Shore. "A Test of Two Hypotheses of Fear of Success." SR 14 (1986): 163-180.

Russell, Connie. "Putting Research into Practice: Conferencing with Young Writers." Exercise Exchange 30 (1984): 333-340.

Sedgwick, Ellery. "Using Peer Rebuttals to Develop Skills in Argumentative Writing." Exercise Exchange 30 (1984): 6-7.

Simpson, Mary K. "What An I Supposed To Do While They Are Writing?" Language Arts 63 (1986): 680-684.

Slavin, Robert. "Cooperative Learning: Can students Help Students Learn?" Instructor. 96.7 (1987): 74-78.

Stay, Byron L. "Talking About Writing: An Approach to Teaching Unskilled Writers." Journal of Teaching Writing 4 (1985): 248-252.

Stanger, Carol. "Sexual Politics of the One-To-One Tutorial Approach." Caywood 41.

Sterkel, Karen Sue. The Relationship Between Gender and Writing Style in Business Communication. Diss. DAI. 48 (1986): 1585A. U of Northern Colorado.

Strenski, Ellen. "Lightening the Burden of Assigned Writing: Editing Guides for Self and Peer Evaluation." History Teacher 16 (1982): 9-17.

Taylor, Sheila Ortiz. "Women in a Double-Bind: Hazards of the Argumentative Edge." CCC. 29 (1978): 385-389.

Thorne, Barrie, Cheris Kramarae, and Nancy Henley, eds. Language, Gender and Society. London: Newbury House, 1983.

Tritt, Michael. "Collaboration in Writing: From Start to Finish and Beyond." English Quarterly 17 (1984): 82-86.

"Using Small Groups in the English Classroom." EJ 76 (1987): 77-80.

Wesson, Anthony J. "Autonomy and the Curriculum: An Exploration of Three Views." Vocational Aspect of Education 38 (1986): 85-91.

West, Candace, and Don H. Zimmerman. "Sex Roles, Interruption and Silences in Conversation." Language and Sex: Difference and Dominance. Eds. Barrie Thorne and Nancy Henley. Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers, Inc., 1975. 105-129.

Wiener, Harvey S. "Collaborative Learning in the Classroom: A Guide to Evaluation." CE 48 (1986): 52-61.

Ziegler, Alan. "Peer Editing." Teachers and Writers Magazine 17 (1986): 10-11.